**UNPUBLISHED**

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS**

**FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

LEONARD E. WHITE, SR.,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

No. 99-2414

JOHN H. DALTON, Secretary,
Department of the Navy,
Defendant-Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria.
T. S. Ellis, III, District Judge.
(CA-99-158-A)

Submitted: July 20, 2000

Decided: August 2, 2000

Before MURNAGHAN and KING, Circuit Judges,
and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

**COUNSEL**

Leonard E. White, Sr., Appellant Pro Se. Rachel Celia Ballow,
OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Alexandria, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

**OPINION**

PER CURIAM:

Leonard E. White, Sr., appeals the district court's order granting the Defendant's motion for summary judgment in this action alleging age, race, and sex discrimination in connection with the elimination of White's job with the Naval Exchange in Rota, Spain. Like the district court, we assume that White established a prima facie case of discrimination. See McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Green, 411 U.S. 792, 802 (1973); Tuck v. Henkel Corp., 973 F.2d 371, 374-75 (4th Cir. 1992). We also agree that the Defendant presented a legitimate, nondiscriminatory reason for his decision: a reduction-in-force necessitated by declining profits. See Texas Dep't of Community Affairs v. Burdine, 450 U.S. 248, 254-56 (1981). Finally, we conclude that the district court correctly found that White failed to meet his burden of persuasion that the proffered reason was a pretext for discrimination. Reeves v. Sanderson Plumbing Prods., ___ U.S. ___, 120 S. Ct. 2097, 2108 (2000). We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinion announced in open court on September 17, 1999, and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See White v. Dalton, No. CA-99-158-A (E.D. Va. September 24, 1999).*

We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED

---

*Although the district court announced its opinion in open court on September 17, 1999, the district court's record shows that judgment was entered on the docket sheet on September 24, 1999. Pursuant to Rules 58 and 79(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, it is the date that the judgment or order was entered on the docket sheet that we take as the effective date of the district court's decision. See Wilson v. Murray, 806 F.2d 1232, 1234-35 (4th Cir. 1986).